BS
637
.N6

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Chap. BS637

Shelf .N6

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

CHRONOLOGY,

ANCIENT AND SCRIPTURAL;

BEING A REPLY TO AN

ARTICLE CONTAINED IN THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, REVIEWING NOTT'S LECTURES ON THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE BIBLICAL AND PHYSICAL HISTORY OF MAN.

[FROM THE SOUTHERN QUARTERLY REVIEW FOR NOVEMBER 1850.]

BY J. C. NOTT, M. D.,
Of Mobile, Ala.

CHARLESTON, S. C.
STEAM-POWER PRESS OF WALKER AND JAMES.
1850.

BS637
.N6

1. *Chine*—ou description historique, géographique et littéraires, de ce vaste Empire, d'après des documens Chinois, comprenant au résumé de l'histoire et de la civilization Chinoises depuis les temps le plus anciens jusqu'a nos jours. Par M. G. PAUTHIER, membre de plusieurs sociétés savantes. Paris. 1839.
2. *Chronologie der Ægypter*. R. LEPSIUS. Berlin. 1849.
3. *Inde*. Par M. DUBOIS DE JANCIGNY, Aide-de-Camp du Roi D'Oude, et par M. XAVIER RAYMOND, Attachè a l'Embassade de Chine. Paris. 1845.
4. *Ancient Monuments of the Mississippi Valley*. By E. G. SQUIER and E. H. DAVIS.
5. *The Southern Presbyterian Review*, conducted by an Association of Ministers, in Columbia, S. C. Vol. iii., No. 3.

THE first two of the above works are amongst the most remarkable productions of our age. They are from authors who have no equals in their respective departments of literature; and their writings have added so largely to our stock of knowledge, that it would hardly be exaggeration to say that their names will mark an epoch in human progress. It would be vain here to attempt an analysis of such works. A simple enumeration of all the writings of Pauthier and Lepsius would serve to give an idea of their herculean labours; but we have not space even for this. The reader who has any taste for Eastern lore, cannot fail to find in their works a rich and ample entertainment.* The work on India, too,

* Works on Egypt are pouring in upon us, and the names, at least, are known to many; but, few readers in this country know any thing about China, and we give a list of such other works of Pauthier as we have seen.

1. Sinico-Ægyptiaca—Essai sur l'origine et la formation similaire des Ecritures figuratures Chinoise et Egyptienne, composè principalement d'après les ecrivains indigènes, &c. Paris. 1842.

2. Esquisse d'une Histoire de la Philosophie Chinoise. 1844.

3. Les Livres Sacrès de l'Orient, (comprising the religious works of China, India, the Koran, etc.) Paris. 1842.

4. De l'Origine et de la Formation des différens Systemès d'Ecritures Orientales et Occidentales. Paris. 1838.

will be found to be one of great ability—"posted up to date"—and full of rich and rare information.

The fourth, on the "Ancient Mounds," is the production of our own country, has attracted much attention in Europe, and is one of which we may well be proud. It supplies a link in the "world's history," which has long been a desideratum.

The last title in our caption, viz, the "Southern Presbyterian Review," differs very widely in its objects from the foregoing works. It shows no morbid anxiety to receive or propagate new truths; but is, on the other hand, eminently *conservative*. We are told, in its "*prospectus*," that it "is devoted mainly to the exposition of the *doctrines* and *polity* of the Presbyterian Church;" and, judging by the only article in it we have read,* it must be admitted that it marches with a bold and steady stride towards its goal, regardless of all impediments, and never, for a moment, forgetting the grateful counsel of Pope:

> "Words are man's province—words we teach alone.
> When reason, doubtful, like the Samian letter,
> Points him two ways, the narrower is the better.
> Placed at the door of learning, youth to guide,
> We never suffer it to stand too wide.
> To ask, to guess, to know, as they commence,
> As fancy opens the quick springs of sense,
> We ply the memory, we load the brain,
> Bind rebel wit, and double chain on chain,
> Confine the thought, to exercise the breath,
> And keep them in the pale of words, till death."

Although, in the article alluded to, we are denounced as "an assailant of religion," as uttering opinions "dangerous to religion, morality and law," ranked with those "infidel writers who have sought to sap the foundation of religion," with many other things, equally charitable and kind, still, we should not, for a moment, have thought of intruding our private griefs on the reader, or of noticing this attack in any way, had not Dr. Howe, in his earnest solicitude to defend his "doctrines," sought to strangle truths which are now struggling into existence—truths, too, which are regarded by many leading minds of the day, as calculated to exert an immense influence on the temporal welfare of the various races of men; and, did

* A Review in No. 3, Jan. 1850, by the Rev. Dr. Howe, of "*Two Lectures, on the Connection between the Biblical and Physical History of Man, &c.* By J. C. Nott, M.D., of Mobile, Alabama.

not the reverend Doctor occupy a station which entitles him to respect, and which gives him a certain influence over the minds of many, who are not in the habit of investigating subjects so vast as the physical history of man.

The study of man, physical and moral, belongs legitimately to the medical profession, and we have been attracted especially to it, by its intrinsic interest and importance, and not by any love of those theological discussions, to which it seems inevitably to lead. When we first commenced writing on this subject, we used our best endeavours to avoid such collisions ; but the "doctrines" of others, and particularly of those who looked to the Bible alone for science, met us at every step, and we were convinced that our forbearance was in vain. We, saw no other course but to speak out, fearlessly and boldly, according to the teachings of modern discovery, regardless of the opposition which we had been taught to expect.

Notwithstanding the extraordinary assertions to the contrary, of Dr. Howe, and of his amiable *collaborateur*, the Rev. Dr. Bachman, the discoveries made in Egypt, during the last twenty years, nay, during the last five, *have put an entirely new face* on the question of the unity of the races. We do not care to waste time in disputes about diversity of *species*, (a question of minor importance, and which may never be settled) ;* but we assert that, in the year 1850, no Egyptologist, of first rate standing, will deny that the white, black, and other races, as distinct as now, existed at an epoch too remote to be reconciled with any chronology yet drawn from either the Hebrew, Samaritan or Septuagint texts of Genesis. It may require yet a few years to conduct ethnography safely through the struggle against "doctrines and polity," which astronomy and geology have passed through; but the dawn is at hand. The chronology of Archbishop Usher, which Doctors of Divinity have so long been "bound to defend," has been battered down by the strong arm of truth ; and the equally untenable Septuagint chronology is now abandoned by Prichard, Bunsen, Lepsius, Birch, Barucchi and others, whose authority it is presumption in the uninformed to question.

* For a masterly paper on the plurality of origins for the human races, see article of Prof. Agassiz, in March number of Christian Examiner. Boston. 1850.

It is but justice to ourselves to say, that, in the outset, we had paid little attention to biblical criticism, and that we turned our attention seriously to it, not with the view, as Dr. Howe charges, of "assailing religion, morality and law;" but, on the contrary, of reconciling, if possible, very embarrassing difficulties. We have failed, it seems, to satisfy others, and we must await patiently "the fullness of knowledge," which is soon and sure to come from wiser heads, now at work.

In searching diligently and honestly for the best lights to relieve our mind from biblical difficulties, we were astonished to find, as remarked by the distinguished Prof. Stuart, of Andover, that no "*critical* commentaries on the Scriptures, of the higher kind," exist "in the English language." The Professor, whose ability and orthodoxy must be admitted by all, makes honourable mention of our popular commentators, Henry, Guise, Orton, Doddridge, Clark, Scott, etc.; "but the professed interpreters," he adds, "of the word, need other aid, and that very different from what these works afford, in order to attain a fundamentally critical knowledge of the original Scriptures." We felt justified, therefore, in appealing to the German commentators, who are considered as at fountain head in philological and historical research; and in our assertion, that it was "men of this stamp, alone, who possessed the knowledge requisite for deciding" the several questions at issue.

Far be it from us to assert that the talent, learning, and honesty are on one side. On the contrary, we know that the German commentators are much divided. Some contend that most of the books of the old Testament have been mutilated and interpolated, and are wanting in historical accuracy. Others, again, confine their objections to the Pentateuch, rejecting a part, or the whole, etc. We do not pretend to have read *all* the German commentators; but, as far as we have gone, we certainly have not met with one who would subscribe to the doctrine of our Presbyterian reviewer, that the "Bible must stand or fall *as a whole*," though we do not deny that such persons may exist. Even Neander, who has written an elaborate and learned Life of Christ, with the avowed object of refuting Strauss, makes admissions, with regard to the New Testament, which would be rank "infidelity" in the eyes of our more divinely favoured reviewer.

It is a very convenient, and, perhaps, admissible mode of argumentation, to charge such small antagonists as ourselves with infidelity, dullness and ignorance; but still, even we cannot but regard it as a little presumptuous, in one unknown to fame, either as a Greek or Hebrew scholar, to blot from the list of authorities, by a simple *coup de plume*, a large proportion of the brightest luminaries of Europe—those, too, men, not only renowned for high talent and learning, but theologians, whose lives have been adorned by all the Christian virtues, and who have held the highest posts of honour to which *they* could aspire, or enlightened *Germany* could accord!

"We are willing to admit," says Dr. Howe, "the genius and eloquence of Eichhorn, the Hebrew learning of Gesenius, the linguistic ability of Ewald, the poetic taste of De Wette, and the useful industry, especially of the younger Rosenmueller; *but*, as authorities in matters of *doctrine*, and especially as to the inspiration of the Scriptures, any one, who knows them, *at once perceives* that they cannot be relied upon for a moment."

Professor Stuart rather taunts this "*haut ton*" of German criticism, as he calls them, with differing widely among themselves, as to the *degree* of historical accuracy of the Old Testament; but, surely, we should not be surprised at the fact, when we recollect the chronological, historical, and other difficulties, which are admitted; and when we recollect that, according to his own statement, the degree of learning necessary for the solution of these difficulties does not exist among English and American theologians. And, we might add to all this, that the German commentators differ no more in their opinions touching Genesis, than do our American and English divines, in their explanations of the four Gospels. No one sect can demand, or is entitled to, more respect than the other; and if we should ask for the creeds of Catholics, Presbyterians, Unitarians, etc., we should find them to differ as widely as Eichhorn, DeWette and Strauss.

As for ourselves, we are not ashamed to confess that we have few really fixed opinions on many of the intricate questions discussed by theologians. We have read commentators of repute in all the schools, and cannot see that their never-ceasing disputes have done much towards clearing up the clouds which hang over Biblical history; nor can we understand how any *well-informed man can* have *positive* opinions on points, respecting which the highest

authorities have been differing for centuries. There seems to be no *proof* attainable—and *doubts* must therefore remain. That the Bible (though full of imperfections, like every thing which passes through human hands,) was a great boon to man, we firmly believe; and that it has been a great promoter of civilization and happiness, in this world, and is preparing us, under God's providence, for the mysterious future, we believe; but when it comes to matters of "*doctrine*" we honestly confess that we are at sea, without a compass. Such a character as that of Christ cannot be of human creation; and, though divines may write thousands of volumes on the "harmony" of the four Gospels, we care little about their verbal accuracy. There is a harmony in the *character* of Christ, and in the *spirit* of his teachings, which can never be explained away.

Although we have never endorsed the doctrines of Strauss, and have merely quoted him once or twice, in matters of *criticism*, we beg leave to do him a simple act of justice, *en passant*. "As to Strauss," says Dr. Howe, "who left his country, *per force*, for his country's good, his system utterly subverts all revealed religion." Whether his system be right or wrong, Strauss certainly had far more ability for judging than his reviewer; and there is a calm, philosophical dignity in his writings, a profound and acknowledged (in Germany) scholarship, and an amiable and Christian-like toleration, which might well teach useful lessons to some who do *not* love their neighbours as themselves, or do by them as they themselves would be done by.

As to the statement of Strauss's "leaving *his country, per force*, for his country's good," we are not informed where the reviewer obtained such information, and hope he will pardon us for doubting its truthfulness. We have before us a letter of Strauss, and a noble one it is, to "*Burgomaster Hirzel, Professor Orelli, and Professor Hitzig, at Zurich*," prefaced by "*an Address to the People of Zurich, by Professor Orelli.*" In the translator's preface, we have the following statement:

"It will be remembered that Dr. Strauss, the celebrated author of "*the Life of Jesus*," when elected, in 1839, by the proper authorities, to the then vacant chair of a Professor of Theology, at the University of *Zurich, in Switzerland*, and ready to leave his abode in Germany, for his new place of destination, was prevented from doing so on account of an insurrection of the people of Zurich, and of the surrounding country. Instigated and headed by their clergy,

they took up arms," (for the love of Christ?) "and declared their determination to prevent his coming, calling him 'a heretic and an unbeliever,'" etc.

The reviewer need not be reminded, that even Christ and the apostles, notwithstanding their much higher claims to toleration, met with even worse treatment than poor Strauss, at the hands of the existing clergy.

But our ruthless reviewer, not satisfied with singling out a few German theologians, who have especially offended against the "religion he is bound to defend," and who have placed themselves "in antagonism to the truth of God," winds up by making a wholesale business of it, and sending the entire fraternity to the devil, *en masse.*

"So loose," says he, "have been the German notions, for many years, the most decent of the *English deists*, had they resided in that country, might have been installed as Professors of Theology, without producing any great commotion."

Poor Strauss must have been something much worse than an infidel, though nothing has been hinted against the purity of his character.

Our reviewer not only complains of our quoting too much from *Germans*, of latitudinarian stamp, "but that, of the long roll of New-England theologians, only Channing, Norton, Palfrey, Parker, etc., could attract his (our) notice." Now, this charge is not strictly correct, for we did quote, several times, and with great respect, Prof. Stuart, the great oracle of his sect; though mainly to prove that "*Critical* commentaries of the higher kind" do not exist "in New-England." But far be it from our wish to do injustice to any class of theologians. We merely quoted these authorities, *et id omne genus*, to show that opinions were as *much divided* in this country as in Europe, as to the historical accuracy of the Pentateuch, etc.

Our avowed object, from the start, in our "Two Lectures," was to "cut the natural history of man loose from the Bible;" and we, therefore, marched the different schools up before the reader; feeling that we might safely leave them together, to settle their disputes, and then take our own road quietly, in search of scientific truth.*

* Our reviewer's pious toleration cannot be confined to the small limits of Germany. Speaking of Dr. Channing, Norton, Palfrey, Parker, etc., he says, "But these were men to whose authority, as *unbiassed* scholars, or divines, we do not defer. We believe their influence to be subversive, not only of the true teachings of the Bible, but of the Bible itself, as an inspired and authoritative revelation from God."

We can find nothing in the Pentateuch which would induce us to believe that its author knew or cared anything about the Unity or Diversity of races, and should be most happy here to drop all farther allusion to the Bible, but that the nature of the subject forbids it.—In the language of the Chevalier Bunsen :

" Christianity engrafted on the limited inquiries of the later Greeks and Romans into the origin of nations, the grand ideas of a creation and of the unity of the human race ; and thus held out to chronological research, as the guide in the new path of science, a novel and unlooked for object. It required that a connection should be established between the primitive traditions of the Bible and the historical traditions of the Gentiles, about the past ages of the world ; and, at the same time, challenged research in order to defend the historical truth of Scripture. From that moment Egyptian research became linked with Jewish, and through it with the whole history of the world." " The assumption that it entered into the scheme of Divine Providence, either to preserve for us a chronology of the Jews and their forefathers by real tradition, or to provide the later commentators with magic powers, in respect to the most exoteric elements of history, may seem indispensable to some, and absurd to others. Historical inquiry has nothing whatever to do with such idle, preposterous and often fallacious assumptions."—(*Egypt's place in Univ. Hist.*)

The physical history of mankind, as wrought out in the last few years, is, to our minds, wholly irreconcilable with the account given in the Book of Genesis ; and as we do not, by any means, subscribe to the doctrine of our reviewer that the " Bible must stand or fall as *a whole*," we have not hesitated to take the ground that the Book of Genesis has not come down to us in a reliable form, and have shown that this opinion is shared by many of the ablest Theologians of our day.

Passing by much that might be said on the authority of the Pentateuch, it is proper, in connection with its *Ethnography*, to state that the historical, or chronological difficulties, are much aggravated by the fact, that we have, coming down to us from antiquity, three distinct Pentateuchs, viz : the Hebrew, the Samaritan, and the Greek texts. They are all received as authority, though differing in facts, and involved in historical obscurity. Though they all offer many serious Ethnological difficulties, we may admit, for the present, that the only important contradiction is in the chronology. This, however, is a point

of vital importance, as there is no history without chronology. We shall see that *all* of them are wrong on this point.

But let us pause for a moment till the reviewer comes up. "What right has Dr. Nott to say that the "original Hebrew text has come down to us in so many mutilated forms, differing from the long lost original? It is an assertion which no *true scholar*, who is not swayed by some amazing prejudice, and does not rush impetuously on some foregone conclusion, would dare to hazard." And then, to convict us of gross ignorance, and "remove all doubt" as to the uniformity of the Hebrew text, he gives from De Rossi "*all* the various readings in more than 800 MSS and editions collated by himself, so far as the first ten chapters of Genesis are concerned." He then goes on to display, in parallel lines, (quoting back at us from Norton to show our "want of scholarship!") these readings; and as all he contends for does not influence the point at issue, in the slightest degree, we may safely admit his assumptions, though he says nothing about the interpretations, anachronisms, &c., &c., which have bothered even the Orthodox.

When, however, we spoke of "*mutilated Hebrew text*," we certainly did not expect to be taken in the restricted sense of the reviewer, nor is it possible that he could have so understood us. We clearly alluded to *all* those texts, Hebrew, Samaritan, and Greek, which have sprung from some unknown original, which it is presumed was in the Hebrew language; *all* these texts being appealed to by divines as authoritative! But if Dr. Howe is willing to rest the argument, touching the common origin of the human races on the *present Hebrew text alone*, we certainly should not object; for, though he is clearly not posted up on the point, it is settled among Egyptologists that the *chronology* of this text (the pivot on which the argument turns) is utterly irreconcilable with the monumental history of Egypt, not to mention the chronology of China, &c. The reviewer, though he manifestly prefers the Hebrew text, *with its short chronology*, has too much tact not to leave a crack through which to crawl out as necessity requires. The Pentateuch, though confessedly originally written in Hebrew (when, where, and by whom, doubtful) has, at unknown epochs, wandered off into Samaritan, and even comparatively modern Greek; and, strange

to say, the Greek version is now mainly relied on; or rather, the advocates for the unity of the races have been compelled to fall back on the chronology of this "degenerate text" as their last hope for chronology!

Let us call the attention of the reader, for a moment, more particularly to this subject of Bible chronology, which, though very simple, is understood by few. Of the antediluvian Patriarchs we shall say nothing, as we have arguments enough without them.

We are told in Genesis that the whole human race was destroyed by the deluge, except Noah and his family; and that, from these are descended all the present inhabitants of the earth. In order that there may be no misunderstanding about the matter, we will here introduce a portion of the XI chapter of Genesis, and beg the reader to bear in mind that there is no other chronology for this period in the Bible. So far, too, from there being any thing to contradict, the reviewer attempts to establish its correctness by quotations from the New-Testament; which, though making very vague allusions to certain things in the Pentateuch, he regards as full endorsement of the whole:

"These *are* the generations of Shem: Shem *was* a hundred years old, and begat Arphaxad two years after the flood:

"And Shem lived, after he begat Arphaxad, five hundred years, and begat sons and daughters.

"And Arphaxad lived five and thirty years, and begat Salah.

"And Arphaxad lived, after he begat Salah, four hundred and three years, and begat sons and daughters.

"And Salah lived thirty years, and begat Eber.

"And Salah lived, after he begat Eber, four hundred and three years, and begat sons and daughters.

"And Eber lived four and thirty years, and begat Peleg.

"And Eber lived, after he begat Peleg, four hundred annd thirty years, and begat sons and daughters.

"And Peleg lived thirty years, and begat Reu.

"And Peleg lived, after he begat Reu, two hundred and nine years, and begat sons and daughters.

"And Reu lived two and thirty years, and begat Serug.

"And Reu lived, after he begat Serug, two hundred and seven years, and begat sons and daughters.

"And Serug lived thirty years, and begat Nahor.

"And Serug lived, after he begat Nahor, two hundred years, and begat sons and daughters.

"And Nahor lived nine and twenty, and begat Terah.

"And Nahor lived, after he begat Terah, a hundred and nineteen years, and begat sons and daughters.

"And Terah lived seventy years, and begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran."

The Pentateuch seems to be designed, almost exclusively, as a history of the Hebrew race, and we have here the generations of Shem, (the son of Noah,) down to father Abraham; thus giving us a clear and distinct chronology, frem the deluge, down to a point which can be sufficiently aproximated for all practical purposes. We have data in Genesis for fixing pretty nearly the entrance of the Israelites into Egypt and their exode. But, in order to present these chronological data in a perfectly clear view, we give these generations in a tabular form, and place beside each other the Hebrew, Samaritan and Septuagint texts. And also, the genealogies according to Josephus:

TABLE OF PATRIARCHAL GENEALOGIES AFTER THE DELUGE.

	GENERATIONS.				RESIDUES.			LIVES		
	Heb.	*Sam.*	*Sept.*	*Joseph.*	*Heb.*	*Sam.*	*Sept.*	*Heb.*	*Sam.*	*Sept.*
1. Deluge—Shem.	2	2	2	12	500	500	500		600	
2. Arphaxad,	35	135	135	135	403	303	403		438	
Cainan,							330			
3. Salah,	30	130	130	130	403	303	303		433	
4. Eber,	34	134	134	134	430	270	270		404	
5. Peleg or Phaleg.	30	130	130	130	209	109	209		239	
6. Reu or Ragan.	32	132	132	130	207	107	207		239	
7. Serug,	30	130	130	132	200	100	200		230	
8. Nahor,	29	79	79	120	119	69	129		148	
9. Terah,	70	70	70	170	135	75	135	205	145	250
10. Abraham,	292	942	1072	993						
Totals.	1948	2249	3334	3229						

We have here the chronology of the human race, as given in Genesis, reduced to the simple rule of addition, and the reader cannot fail to be struck, at first glance, by the wide discrepancy of the texts as to the epoch of Abraham, viz: 292—942—and 1072 years—notwithstanding our "want of *scholarship*" in complaining that the Hebrew text had come down to us in so many mutilated forms." We here, too, see ample grounds for those amiable disputes amongst theologians, which cast a doubt over

the soundness of the reviewer's doctrine, that insists upon receiving the Bible "*as a whole*," without asking any questions. We do not doubt the reviewer's honesty and sincerity, but confess, that, from the numerous extraordinary conclusions he has arrived at, in the course of his critique, we are forced to believe that he is utterly incapable of investigating, fairly, any point which comes in contact with those religious opinions he was taught in early life. How can he so stoutly contend for the historical accuracy of any text, when he is compelled to fall back on the Greek translation, where it suits his convenience to do so. Is it not strange, too, that the original text could thus be mutilated, and no body be able to tell when, where, or how it was done—mutilated, too, in its most vital part? If the book of Genesis has been tampered with here, what guaranty have we for the rest of it? Where is the proof of the truthfulness of the genealogies, and other Ethonological facts, which we shall show are contradicted by modern discovery and science?

"We pity Dr. Nott," says our truly benevolent reviewer "in his deep bewilderment, on the dark mountains where he is wandering; we would fain reach him a helping hand;" and he certainly here comes like a ministering angel to relieve us from our sad dilemma. "It is well known," says Professor Howe, "to all who have turned their attention to this subject (chronology) that there is a great difference between the chronology of the Hebrew Bible, and of the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch. The deluge happened according to the Septuagint B. C. 3246—according to the Samaritan Pentateuch, 2998; according to the Hebrew, 2288, according to the English Bible 2348.The difference between the two extremes is 958 years. The creation of the whole world, according to the Septuagint, took place 5886 B. C.; according to the Samaritan Pentateuch, 4304 B. C.; according to the Hebrew text, 4104; according to Arch Bishop Usher and English Bible, 4004 B. C.; making a difference between the extremes of 1882 years." "This difference appears to be the result, not of accident, *but of design;* to have arisen not from the casual errors of transcribers, but from *studied alteration*, or adaptation in the Samaritan and Hebrew compilation, or in that of the LXX; an adaptation which has occurred long subsequent to the time when the original Scriptures were written."

After this, has the reader any idea of what the Doctor means by *mutilation of texts?* Is the religion of Jesus Christ to "stand or fall," with books like these—all taken together—the whole or none?

Professor Stuart has spoken bold and manly truth in the following language:

"The truth plainly is, that the public mind begins to be weary of being tossed so long on a tempestuous sea of conjecture, in regard to the meaning of Scripture. Men of inquiring minds wish to know what the Bible says when interpreted by principles of exegesis which are stable, well grounded, and capable of an honest, and open, and intelligible defence."*

Though differing widely from Professor Stuart in his *doctrines*, we commend the boldness, manliness and honesty with which he sets his face against all 'occult' meanings of the Bible language, contends for its straightforward signification and intent, and grapples with difficulties instead of dodging them by ingenious interpretations, which make it mean any thing or nothing.

We really feel as if we were doing God's service as well as man's service—not speaking irreverently—in killing off such commentators as this reviewer; and we pray the reader to bear with us a little longer, for, though we cannot afford the time or space which is necessary to expose a tithe of his blunders, we wish to say enough to silence him for the future.

"Dr. Nott, again, speaks disrespectfully of the English version of the Scriptures. He makes the astonishing assertion that 'the Hebrew language may be said only to have been recovered within the last century, by modern orientalists.' Most surprising is it that any one could believe that the Jews should have wholly lost a knowledge of their ancient and sacred tongue; and that a knowledge of it should only have been recovered by modern orientalists, displays an amazing want of reading and scholarlike accuracy, and a credulity exceedingly rare, *except in an unbeliever, &c.*"

We feel assured that Bunsen, Lepsius, Birch, Lance, Cohen, and other philologists of our day, would not be so much astounded as Dr. Howe, at the assertion that there is *more Hebrew learning in the 19th century than has been at any time for two thousand years*—and that there was not Hebrew knowledge enough in England in 1611, A. D. to

*Interpretation of prophecy.

make a good translation of the Bible. Passing over the well-known fact that it *is* so, what is there so extraordinary that the Jews, when we call to mind their melancholy history, should have lost much of their ancient language? In the 8th century, B. C., the ten tribes were conquered and carried captive into Assyria. Not only is *their language lost*, but it is a matter of dispute what has become of the tribes themselves! In the 6th century, B. C., the remaining two tribes were conquered and carried to Babylon, where they remained seventy years, till released and sent back by Cyrus—many remained, through preference, in Babylon, and the others returned to Palestine, *speaking a foreign language; and from that day to this, the Hebrew has been a dead language—a period of about* 2,500 *years!* More especially, since the destruction of the temple by Titus, 70 A. D., have the Jews been proverbially a scattered and persecuted race; without good seminaries of learning, without libraries, without peace, quiet, and other requisites for deep philological studies. Even the Septuagint translation, supposed to have been made by learned Jews, before Christ, in the palmy days of Alexandrian learning, is pronounced by Bunsen to be "creditable," and De Wette, whose authority will not be questioned, says that it betrays the want of an accurate acquaintance with the Hebrew language.*

* A few extracts from De Wette, than whom no higher authority exists in Germany, should quiet in some degree the astonishment of Dr. Howe.

"A knowledge of the language (Hebrew) which is contained in the scanty relics of the Old Testament, has been preserved, though *but imperfectly*, by *means of tradition.* Some time after the destruction of Jerusalem, in the Palestine and Babylonian schools, and after the 11th century, in those of Spain, this tradition was aided by the study of the Arabic language and its grammar. Jerome learned the Hebrew from Jewish scholars. Their pupils were the restorers of Hebrew learning among the Christians in the 16th century."

The lexicographers, grammarians and commentators—Abulwalid, David Kimchi, Elias Levita, Jarchi, Aben Esra, Tanchem, and others, preserve this tradition of the learned. In general it attains to a high degree of credibility, though, in the course of time, *much has been lost, and many errors have been admitted.*"

De Wette passes in review the various versions, or translations, commencing with the Septuagint (made before Christ); and coming down to those of later date.—He handles them pretty roughly. Of the Septuagint, the most celebrated, he says:

"As a whole, the version is chargeable with want of literalness, and also an arbitrary method, whereby something foreign to the text is brought in. In general it betrays the want of an accurate acquaintance with the Hebrew language, &c."

See Parker's translation of De Wette, Boston, 1843.

See, also, *Munk's Palestine*,—The reviewer will there find an admirable history of the Hebrew language, and the manner in which it is *being* reclaimed.

Where are the Hebrew grammars, lexicons, and other evidences of Jewish philology, previous to the 18th century? Who are the Hebrew scholars comparable to Gesenius, De Wette, Ewald, Eichorn, Cohen, and a hundred others that might be named? Can the reviewer call the name of an English or American Jew who will rank with these scholars? The Doctor has a very convenient way occasionally of getting round difficulties; he tells us that Selden speaks of it (English translation) as the best in the *world*.—Horsely, "as having enriched and adorned our language"—and so on, with Dr. White, Dr. Geddes, &c. Did it ever occur to the reviewer to ask how these men would rank in Germany as Hebrew scholars? "Professor Stewart," he continues, "represents it as the best *effort at a translation amongst the English divines* (!!!) with the exception of Lowth's classic work on Isaiah." How came Lowth to know more Hebrew than the other English divines? Does not the reviewer know, too, that greater facilities *now* exist than have existed for 2000 years for studying this language? There are more Hebrew MSS. now accessible to students in Europe—there are better Lexicons and Grammars—early contemporary languages are now more readily compared from the facilities afforded by printing, and from the extension of philological researches, which are every day clearing up doubtful points—in short, we are really ashamed at having to argue with a Theological professor on a point like this.

When the reviewer comes to the geography—Ethiopia—Cush, &c.—of the Bible, he dives into such a heterogeneous mass of learning that we cannot pretend to follow him. Like the cuttle-fish, he so blackens the water behind him as effectually to baffle all pursuit. At one time he tells the old tradition (which Anthon, Lardner, and every authority treats as fable) about Tyrian sailors, under Pharaoh Necho, circumnavigating Africa "2100 years before Vasquez de Gama doubled the Cape of Good Hope." Then he demonstrates the early commercial intercourse between China and Egypt, (*quoting from Crania Egyptiaca*) by telling us of porcelain vessels bearing chinese inscriptions, found in the monuments of Thebes. He is not at all aware that Pauthier has recently shown all these porcelains to be *modern*, as proven by the fact that all the inscriptions are in characters not invented till comparatively *modern* times! It would neither amuse nor

instruct the reader to follow the reviewer in all his meanderings through facts and fable on these points; and with these—we take it—sufficient showings up in respect to them, we shall turn to other passages.*

Again, "the difficulties found by Dr. Nott, with the Ethnography of the Bible, fill us with *increased* amazement."

Here again we must decline following, in detail, the profitless wanderings of the reviewer, and refer the reader to the head, "Ethnography," of our "two Lectures," the argument of which he leaves entirely untouched. We there showed that large cities, populous nations, different tongues, &c., are spoken of in Genesis, *in the third or fourth generations after Adam and Noah*, thus proving that our texts *are wrong*. If farther confirmation be wanting, it will be found in the history of Egypt and China.

We cannot, however, resist the temptation to give a specimen of the desperate shifts to which our reviewer and his associates are driven for arguments when pushed to the wall. He thus populates the earth after the creation:

"The mother of all (Eve) was *doubtless* a fruitful vine, and both she and Adam were in the vigor of their lives, for a length of years which the *postdeluvians knew nothing of*.† Cain was a married man (?) when he slew Abel, and was then not less than 129 years of age. Seth, who was appointed by God to occupy the place of Abel, whom Cain slew, was born to Adam when he was 130 years old. The natural increase of man is extremely rapid when no hindrance is interposed. 'An Island first occupied by a few shipwrecked English sailors, in 1589, and discovered by a Dutch vessel in 1667, *is said* to have been found peopled, after 80 years, by 12,000 souls, all the descendants of 4 mothers.'" "When the Creator *undertook* to people the earth, we *may suppose* that his providence *arranged* for this end, and *no hindrance* was allowed to interpose. It

* We are indebted to the kindness of Mr. Birch for a pamphlet, entitled "Observations on the Statistical Tablet of Karnack," by himself, which we recommend to the reviewer. It is a most curious and instructive account of Egyptian commerce and conquests, as far back as Cheops—long before Abraham.

† This remark is perfectly true, for Sarah laughed, and Abraham was astonished, when the Lord told them, at the ages respectively of 90 and 100 years, that they should have a child. They, too, *were contemporaries* of Noah, Shem, Ham, Japheth, and of course, were familiar with their ancestor's history, from Adam down. Even these incredible ages of the Patriarchs do not remove chronological difficulties, and Prichard, himself, has abandoned them as untenable and useless.

is *believed* that the death of Abel was the first which occurred in the family of man. It is not an unreasonable *supposition*, *therefore*, as *figures demonstrate*, that the family of Adam embraced from 191,000 to 200,000 people at the banishment of Cain."

Yes, simple reader, 200,000 descendants from a single pair in 130 years!!!

How can we argue a grave subject like that before us, when we are met by such absurdities as these? Though our reverend reviewer has not the slightest authority, or reason, for his hypothesis, he assumes that human nature was entirely different in the beginning from what it has been for the last 4 or 5000 years; that Adam and Eve were endowed with supernatural "vigour;" that they had children previous to Seth;—then quotes a ridiculous statement from the proverbially credulous Wiseman, showing that 12,000 souls came from four mothers in 80 years, &c. Why does he have to travel off after facts that have no vouchers or probability? "What "hindrance" has there been in the United States, and other countries, to the increase of population? Did any body ever hear of four mothers, in 80 years, producing 1000 souls; much less of 200,000 from a pair in 130 years—or even 12,000 from four mothers in 80 years? And then, to embellish the picture, we must imagine the most horrible incest of fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, &c., mingled together in violation of the laws of God, laws of humanity, and laws of nature;—we say laws of nature, for we know that a race cannot be perpetuated, and must degenerate, through such revolting and incestuous practices. Malthus, if our memory serves, imagines circumstances under which a population might possibly double in 10 years, and, at this rate, 130 years would give, from a pair, about 8000; but even this is a rate of increase without example. The United States does not double in 20 years, with the immense tide of *emigration* from all parts of Europe added to the births. And yet the reviewer gravely spins a yarn about 12,000 souls from four mothers in 80 years! The reviewer, of course insists strongly upon the vigour of the prolific patriarchs, continued through their long lives of little less than 1000 years; but, admitting his premises, he cannot keep up with the cities, tongues, nations, immense populations which we find covering the face of the land. He has not, with all, *chronology* enough, by at least 1000 years, even with the aid of the Septuagint. But when

such men as Prichard give up the ages of the Patriarchs, as every reasonable man must, such writers as our reviewer may well spare themselves the unnecessary argument. The issue is at an end.

But we have no wish to waste time with the antediluvian generations; the postdiluvian embrace all that is *essential* to our present argument. We are told that all the inhabitants of the earth, except Noah and his family, were destroyed by the deluge, and that, from these, are descended *all* the *present* races of the earth. There were, (as exhibited in our table) only 10 generations, according to Genesis, between the flood and Abraham; and these generations, according to the Hebrew text, which is entitled to most respect, consumed but 292 years—a period confessedly too short to account for the immense population—its wide dispersion—the diversity of types, and numerous events which preceded Abraham. If we retreat, as the advocates of *unity* are compelled to do, upon the Septuagint chronology (the longest admissible) of 1072 years, we are still very far short of the true antiquity of our present races. as will be seen when we speak of Egypt. We are told in Genesis, that, only three generations after Noah, there were already "great cities," as Nineveh, Rehoboth, Calah, Risen, &c.; that Nimrod, the grand-son of Ham, "began to be a mighty one in the earth;" that different languages already existed; that Abraham had left in Chaldea a populous country; had found, on his arrival, the "Canaanites in the land;" that, when driven to Egypt by famine, he found there a Pharaoh ruling over a mighty kingdom, as we shall see of 7 or 8,000,000 of inhabitants, in a high state of civilization; and, according to Lepsius, Bunsen, Birch, and all *competent* authority, the Pyramids already erecting their proud summits to designate the resting places of twelve extinct dynasties.

"As to the physical history of man," says Dr. Howe, "so far as touched upon by Dr. Nott, we must leave it chiefly in abler hands." We must here commend the prudence and discretion of the reviewer, and regret, for his own reputation, that he had not left it entirely to his friend, Dr. Bachman. whose even more extraordinary blunders we shall take much delight in exposing on a future occasion.

We understand him to admit clearly, that "the negro does not become a white man, nor the black man white" under the influence of *modern* physical causes; but, as ac-

cording to his *doctrines*, it must have happened at *some time* or other, it becomes necessary, in order to carry his point, to upset the even current of nature's law by one of those convenient *theories* which come to his aid so often. "The only thing," says he, "which this theory supposes is, that, in the early ages after the flood, and *before the first monumental evidence** of the existence of the various types and complexions of men, causes operated under a special providence, with a rapidity and power far beyond that which is ordinary *now*." "The God of nature can stir into quicker action, or give a new direction to the powers of nature; for man himself, within his limited circle, can do so and make them accomplish his purpose.—Electricity, chemistry, and steam are in our day accomplishing wonders."

When an antagonist is driven to this sort of logic, in a question of *facts*, it would be an insult to any understanding to offer at serious refutation.

We shall, therefore notice but a single point, where he brings to his aid the oft quoted statement of Professor Tiedeman, of Heidelberg, on the brain of the negro, compared with the European and ourang-outang. (*Phil. Trans.*, 1836, pp. 519,520. Our reviewer's object is to prove that, "the brain of the negro is not inferior to that of other races of men;" and he quotes the following sentence from our lectures as a text: "Dr. Morton has established the fact, that the cranial capacity of the Mongol, Indian, and Negro, and all dark skinned men, is smaller than that of the *pure white man*."

We beg leave here to quote him fully, as the point is really one of just importance. He says

"This statement is made in such a form that it cannot be gainsaid. Yet, *if* Dr. Nott, had used the term *Caucasian* instead of the "*pure white* man," it would not have been impregnable. Tiedeman's testimony is entitled to as much weight as Morton's, and his measurements have every appearance of being perfectly accurate. He adds to his own testimony, that of Dr. Hamilton, who also instituted experiments to the same end. If Dr. Morton's collection is the largest of any individual in the world, Tiedeman had the public and private collections of Germany, England, Scotland and Ireland before him. Only in the crania of the Aboriginal tribes of America, had Dr. Morton the advantage. Of the other varieties, Tiedeman's

* Bear in mind, reader, that the "first monumental evidence," according to Lepsius, Bunsen, Birch, Barrucchi, Gliddon, &c., &c., was *prior to the Genesis date of the flood*, and that the races were already distinct.

measurements were more than twice as numerous. The respective number of skulls measured, is as follows :

	Tiedeman.	Morton.
Caucasian skulls	117	52
Mongolian "	20	10
Malay "	43	18
American "	27	147
Ethiopean "	41	29
	248	256

"The following digest of Tiedeman's tables may be acceptable to those who are curious in such matters, and will be understood if it is borne in mind that the weight is not of the actual brain itself, but of millet seed, with which the various crania were filled to ascertain their relative capacity. Dr. Morton adopted the same method of filling the crania, but gives the measurement of the internal capacity in inches.

No. of Skulls.	*Caucasians of Europe, Asia and Africa.*		*Malay, American, Mongolian, and Ethiopean.*	
		lb–oz–dr–gr.		
77	European skulls average weight,	3–5–2–30		lb–oz–dr–gr.
38			Malay skulls,	3–4–6–21
4	Egyptian	3–4–4–56		
24			American (Indian,)	3–3–7–12
18			Mongolian,	3–2–7–55
38			Ethiopean,	3–1–6–24
24	Asiatic	3–0–0–36		

These were all skulls of males; the measurements of females are not added; omitting the Egyptian, which were four in number, the average of the Caucasian is 3–2–5–33.

Among the Ethiopean crania are those of nations of Congo, Madagascar, Loango, Guinea, Angola, Mozambique, Bushmen, Caffres, Hottentots, and Ashantees. His Asiatics embrace the crania of the following nations: one Russian, from Orenburg; one Werschandier, beyond Mount Taurus; one American; one Arab; four Cingalese; eight Hindoos; one Birman; two Circassians; three Georgians; two Parsees. It thus appears that, though the *European Caucasians stand highest*, the Asiatic Caucasians stand lowest for cranial capacity, and that if the average be taken of the *whole* Caucasian race, they will be inferior to all the rest, the Ethiopean excepted."

Now, we are much indebted to Dr. Howe for this table, for we certainly could not find more reliable and conclusive facts to substantiate our assertion, as to the difference in the "cranial capacity" of races.

"If Dr. Nott," says our reviewer, "had used the term *Caucasian*, instead of '*pure white man*,'" he would have

had, he thinks, the argument all his own way; but we *did not* use the term *Caucasian*, and we omitted it *intentionally*. We have before said that we can see no reason (if the ethnology of Genesis is untenable) why the Almighty may not have created, at different points, a hundred pairs of human beings, as well as one. Nor can we see any reason why the arbitrary term, *Caucasian*, should be persisted in, after it is ascertained that the Hebrews, Egyptians, Hindoos, &c., (heretofore included under this term) were as distinct as now, from each other, at an epoch so early as to be incompatible with even the long chronology of the Septuagint!

According to Tiedeman's measurements, the average weight of European brains is about *five ounces* greater than the Asiatic! Now, who were these Asiatics? They were principally Hindoos, who, from the earliest records and monuments, possessed substantially the same physical type as now—dark skins, small heads, &c. The Israelites, too, were *Asiatics*, but certainly Tiedeman would not contend that they had five ounces less of brain than Europeans! We have shown, in another place, that the Hebrew head has not changed during, at least, 3,500 years, in any climate; and we have the true skulls of Egyptians, entombed 5,000 years ago. According to this table, too, we have the brain of the negro about four ounces less than the European, and three ounces less than the Egyptian, though the Egyptian and negro both lived in Africa, at least 4,000 years ago. We have alluded, in other places, to the antiquity of the Chinese, the aborigines of America, &c. The measurements of Dr. Morton confirm substantially those of Tiedeman.

We really hope and believe, after all this, that we shall never hear any more ethnography from the Rev. Dr. Howe; though he may enlighten the world, one of these days, with the evidences of "*Alphabetic* writing, antedating the time of Moses." Before, however, he undertakes the latter task, at which he hints, we would advise him, for his own reputation, to study carefully the several works of Pauthier, Bunsen, Lepsius, Lanci, &c., on this point.

The reviewer's comments on Chinese and Hindoo chronology, should be classed under the head of the *ludicrous* merely. It will take stronger muscles than ours, to read them with the orthodox gravity of aspect, under which,

doubtless, they were penned. It was asserted by Dr. Nott, in his Lectures, that the chronology of Genesis is destroyed by its own inconsistences; and that it could be shown, from the monuments of Egypt, China, India, America, &c., that it has no historical ground-work whatever.

"This," says the reviewer, "is assuredly a large and boastful promise. We see him, a very Goliah, flourishing his spear like a weaver's beam, and defying the armies of Israel. Where are these monuments of India? Are they of paper, earth or stone? Does the Dr. refer to the Puranas and their Yugs, covering a period of 4,320,000 years? And where are his monuments of China? Does he then believe that one emperor reigned 18,000, another 18,000, and another 45,600 years? Does he not know that the Chinese themselves regard their high chronology as fabulous; that their respectable historians do not allude to it, except to call it in question?"

The first idea which crossed our brain after reading all this, was the desperate charge of Don Quixote upon the wind-mills; for we certainly gave no provocation for such a crusade against time and space as this. We simply asserted that "Pauthier, the greatest Chinese scholar of the age, assures us that the Chinese records give indubitable evidence of a succession of emperors, from the year 2,637 B. C., down to the present day, nearly 5,000 years," and that he even extended the history, though in less authentic form, to the time of the great Fou-hi, 3,468 years B. C. We did not make the slightest allusion to those fabulous tales, which his reverence seems resolved to tilt against. And, to make the whole affair the more ridiculous, he brings up a single authority, (unknown to fame, amongst Chinese scholars) the *Rev. Mr. Medhurst*, to make out his case, and, after all, ends—by *refuting himself!*

The reviewer evidently never saw Pauthier's great work on China, and it may be doubted whether he knew there was such an author in existence; though, on every thing connected with China, his reputation in Europe, is like that of Lepsius in Egyptian matters. It may not, therefore, be uninteresting to the reviewer to learn something of this author's scheme of chronology.

Pauthier, speaking of the antiquity of the Chinese nation, divides its history into three periods, viz: the ante-historic, the semi-historic, and the historic. The first, or purely fabulous, has been sufficiently commented on by our reviewer. The semi-historic we also excluded from

our little book, as wanting the confirmation necessary for our purpose; though, like the early days of Greece and Rome, (before faithful records were kept and transmitted) it must have consumed much time; and Pauthier tells us, that its ground-work rests upon such solid foundation, that, "*quelques historiens même, très-rationnels, comme le célèbre* Tchou-hi (ou Tchou-Fou-Tseu) *sont remonté jusqu' à* 3,400 *ans avant cette même epoque,*" (*Christian era.*)

When we come down to the *historic period*, which begins 2,637 B. C., we get on unquestionably firm ground, which is *not* "*regarded by the Chinese themselves as fabulous,*" but, on the contrary, is regarded by *all* Chinese historians as indisputable.

"*L'examen critique*, (says Pauthier) *de la chronologie Chinoise, que l'empereur* Kien-Loung *fit faire par le collège des* Han-lin, *ou* Academie Imperiale, *et par touts les corps littéraire de sa capitale, et qu' il fit imprimer dans son palais en* 1767, *ne fait remonter le premier cycle de soixante années, de* 365 *jours* 6 *heures chacune, qu' à la* 61*e année de cet empereur, ou* 2,637 *avant J. C.; laissant ainsi les* 60 *premières, ou la valeur d'un cycle, dans les temps doûteux. C'est ce tableau chronologique qui porte ainsi le plus haut charactère de certitude, et dont nous avons un exemplaire entre les mains, que nous avons suivies contamment pour les dates, dans le cours de cet ouvrage.*"

The reviewer will also find in this work a well authenticated account of the celebrated "*inscription de Yu,*" on a rock of Mount *Heng-chau*, bearing date of 2,278 B. C. "Cette inscription originale en vieux charactéres Chinois nommè *ko-téou*, a forme de *tetard*, que l'on dit avoir été inventé par Fou-Hi, 2,950 avant notre ére." Whether or not these ancient writing characters go back to 2,950 B. C., they must go far beyond Usher's date of the flood, and leave no doubt that China had a language, a literature, and population, peculiar to itself, and disconnected from the known nations of antiquity. The inscription of Yu antedates the epoch of Abraham some 200 years.

Amongst other curious evidences of the antiquity of China, Pauthier gives details of the manners and customs of these early times;—pictures of royal hunting scenes; and of people living on the confines of the empire; but, perhaps, the most remarkable and conclusive fact is, that of an eclipse of the sun, recorded in the Chou-King, (Livre Sacré) during the reign of Tchoung-Kang; and for not foretelling which, the astronomers Hi and Ho were put to

death. This eclipse occurred in the year 2,155 B. C. We are not aware that any good authority, in China, or out of it, doubts the astronomical knowledge of the Chinese at this day; and this knowledge, as well as the physical type of that people, at that epoch, leave no doubt of a long previous history.

But we made allusion to the reviewer's refutation of himself, and here we give it. "In the days of YAOU, their first King, answering *perhaps* to Noah, a great inundation occurred, the sky falling on the earth, and destroying the race of men. The date of this inundation is *fixed by Medhurst from native documents* at 2296 B. C., and the beginning of Yaou's reign at B. C. 2356. These dates accord then with those of the Hebrew Text. If we assume the Septuagint Chronology and Pauthier's statement, five or six hundred years is no brief period," &c.

Here then, according to his own statement, the reviewer carries back Chinese *records* to 2356 B. C.! How long, let us ask, is it probable that the nation existed previous to this date; when we reflect that these records were written in characters unlike those of all other nations, and that we have ample evidence also of a peculiar physical type, peculiar manners, customs, religion, &c.? But, so far from coinciding with the opinions of the reviewer and Medhurst, Pauthier carries the *positive* historic period back to HOANG-TI, 2637 B. C., not to mention a long ante-historic period, which no Chinese historian doubts. Abraham certainly knew nothing of China, or its literature, which was contemporary with that of Egypt, which he visited;—nor could any of the ten generations which preceded Abraham have known any thing of Chinese history; for it must not be forgotten that Abraham, according to the "*Hebrew Text*," was 58 years old when Noah died. But every tyro in Egyptian history knows that Usher's date of the flood cannot stand against Egyptian Chronology, and the idea of mixing up Chinese and Jewish records, is too absurd to require serious notice, in the year 1850, even though with the temptation before us of playing the reviewer!

We should not, however, omit the following precious quotation, which our reviewer gives from Medhurst:

"It is evident that *Pawn-koo*, the first man, according to the fabulous records of the Chinese, who acted at the separation of hea-

ven and earth, could not have been long before *Fuh-he*, perhaps a thousand years—certainly not ten thousand; and the time of *Fuh-he* must have have been very near *Yaou* and *Shun*, perhaps a hundred years—certainly not a thousand. No scholar should decline a thorough inquiry."

Now, our reviewer did not comprehend one idea in this paragraph, or he certainly *would have declined* entering into the inquiry. The reader will call to mind that the reviewer has fixed the reign of YAOU at the year 2356 B. C.) (which he tells us accords with the Hebrew Text!) next, *Pawn-koo*, he cuts down to one thousand before *Fuh-he*, and the latter to one hundred before *Yaou;* add these together, and we have 3456 B. C., or about two hundred years beyond the Septuagint date of the flood!*

After an exposure of blunders such as these, we cannot think of imposing on the reader, by commenting on the "Chronology of India," which the reviewer has been unable to meet with any thing but ridicule. If he will but take the trouble to read some approved book on the history of the Sanskrit language, (the parent of so many *ancient* languages,) it may prove a useful lesson to him, without reference to "stone," or "earthen monuments," which are not wanting. We presume no student of Indian antiquity will doubt that India was one of the earliest centres of population on our globe. The work on India, of our caption—the Livres Sacrés, of Pauthier—alone contains ample material, and is one to which the student may safely be referred. On the subject of ancient Chronology, by the way, Humboldt, in his Cosmos, has a passage bearing directly on this point, and Humboldt is a gentleman and a Christian, whom even Bachman and Howe, and Smyth, and others of the very evangelical school, will hardly venture to gainsay. Bachman, indeed, gives testimony in his favor. He describes him as one who "has perpetuated no doctrines that are opposed to the laws of nature—that are injurious to morals or subversive of Christianity."

The following passages are from "Cosmos," Harper's edition, 1850, vol. 2, pp. 114, 115.

"In the dimness of antiquity, which constitutes as it were, the

* "The state of China," says the reviewer," can only be erected into an argument against revelation by a prejudiced or unreflecting mind." When he throws up stones he should be careful to "stand from under."

extreme horizon of true historical knowledge, we see many luminous points, or centres of civilization, simultaneously blending their rays. Among these we may reckon Egypt at least five thousand years before our era, Babylon, Nineveh, Kashmir, Iran, and also China, after the first colony migrated from the north-eastern declivity of the Kuenslum into the lower river valley of the Hoang-ho.

"The principal chronological data for Egypt are as follows:—'Mene, 3900 B. C. at least, and probably tolerably correct; 3430, commencement of the fourth dynasty, which included the pyramid builders, Chephren Schafra, Cheops-Chufu, and Mykerinos or Kenkera; 2200, invasion of the Hyksos under the twelfth dynasty, to which belongs Amenemha III., the builder of the original Labyrinth. A thousand years, at least, and probably still more, must be conjectured for the gradual growth of a civilizatiou which had been completed, and had in part begun to degenerate, at least 3430 years B. C.' (Lepsius, in several letters to myself, dated March, 1846, and therefore after his return from his memorable expedition.) Compare, also, Bunsen's Considerations on the Commencement of Universal History, which, strictly defined, is only a history of recent times, in his ingenious and learned work, *Ægyptens Stelle in der Weltgeschichte*, 1845, erstes Buch, s. 11–13. The historical existence and regular chronology of the Chinese go back to 2400, and even to 2700 before our era, far beyond Ju-to Hoangsty. Many literary monuments of the thirteenth century B. C. are extant, and in the twelfth century B. C., Thscheu-li records the measurement of the length of the solstitial shadow taken with such exactness by Tscheu-kung, in the town of Losyang, south of the Yellow River, that Laplace found that it accorded perfectly with the theory of the alteration of the obliquity of the ecliptic, which was only established at the close of the last century. All suspicion of a measurement of the earth's direction derived by calculating back, falls therefore to the ground of itself. See Edouard Biot, *Sur la Constitution Politique de la Chine au 12eme Siecle avant notre ere*, 1845, p. 3 and 9. The building of Tyre and of the original temple of Melkrath, (the Tyrian Hercules,) would, according to the account which Herodotus received from the priests (II., 44.) reach back 2760 years before our era. Compare, also, Heereen, *Ideen uber Politik und Verkehr der Volker*, th. i., 2, 1824, s. 12. Simplicius calculates, from a noticc transmitted by Porphyry, that the date of the earliest Babylonian astronomical observations which were known to Aristotle, was 1903 years before Alexander the Great; and Ideler, who is so profound and cautious as a chronologist, considers this estimate in no way improbable. See his *Handbuch der Chronologie*, bd. i., s. 207; the *Abhanlungen der Berliner Akad. auf das Jahr*, 1814, s. 217; and Bockh, *Metrol. Untersuchungen uber die Masse des Allerthums*, 1838, s. 36. Whether safe historic ground is to be found in India earlier than 1200 B. C., according to the

chronicles of Kashmeer, (*Radjatanrangini*, trad. par Troyer,) is a question still involved in obscurity; while Megasthenes, (*Indica*, ed. Schwanbeck, 1846, p. 50,) reckons for 153 Kings of the dynasty of Magadha, from Manu to Kandragupta, from sixty to sixty-four centuries, and the astronomer Aryabhatta, places the beginning of his chronology, 3102 B. C. (Lassen, *Iad. Alterthumsk.*, bd. i., s. 473-505, 507.")

Moreover, though Humboldt expresses his belief in unity of species, *scientifically* speaking, I am not aware that he has any where asserted that all races are of "one blood." He quotes with approbation the following passage from "the noble and comprehensive work, *Physiologie des Menschen*, of Johannes Muller, one of the greatest anatomists of the day:"

"But whether the human races have descended from *several* primitive races of men, or from *one* alone, is a question which cannot be determined from experience."

The reviewer's "surprise," and "amazement," at our folly and ignorance, seems to increase, with the *rapidity* of his ante-diluvian population. We expressed the opinion that there were some inklings of long chronology in the admirable work of Squier & Davis, on the "*Ancient Monuments of the Valley of the Mississippi.*" Then, thus our reviewer:

"Most surprising of all is Dr. Nott's declaration, that *probably America* contained an immense population, with organized governments, and was advanced in civilization 'as far back as the spurious LXX date of the flood. 'The extreme antiquity of the mound builders of America,' which looms so largely in the intellectual horizon of Dr. Nott, bears no proportion, as set forth in their interesting work, to the antiquity of the chosen people of God. We can discover *no trace* of an opinion in the book in question, that the authors had any idea of so high an antiquity in reference to the mound builders, as the one asserted."

We shall soon see which of us has the best pair of eyes; and we hope to show that the reviewer here, as elsewhere, can see nothing but what he "wishes to see." He goes on to prove from the writings of Stephens, Clavigero, Prescott, and even Squier & Davis, that the Monuments of America could "hardly have been constructed *till six hundred and forty-eight years A. D.!* and "do not, therefore *reach the date in question by nearly three thousand nine hundred years.*"

"Thus does the strange fancy of Dr. Nott, as to the age of the mound builders, and other antiquities of America, melt like frost-work before the *probabilities* of history."

But let us see how stand the *facts*. We will first give the dates of Clavigero, (adopted by the reviewer,) for the earliest *recorded* migrations of these *mound builders;* for we presume the reviewer will concede, as it suits *short* Chronology best, that they were the same race as the Mexicans, Peruvians, and other semi-civilized tribes.

The Toltecs arrived in Anahuac, or the country now called Mexico, *migrating from the North*, A. D., - 648
They abandoned the country, - - " - 1051
The Chichemecs arrived, - - - " - 1170
The Acholhuans arrived about, - - " - 1200
The Mexicans reached Tula, - - " - 1296
They founded Mexico, - - - - " - 1325

Now, so far from 648 A. D. being the extreme of aboriginal chronology, is there not every reason to infer that these migrations *begin* where the history of the Mounds *ends?* Squier and Davis, Gallatin, Morton, etc., tell us that this people, pressed upon by unknown causes, migrated, from the 7th to the 12th centuries, and have not left even a traditionary trace amongst their savage successors. And over this immense country, which they once occupied, (bounded by the Atlantic, Pacific, the Lakes and the Gulf,) are scattered many thousand mounds, which required, for their construction, immense labour, and which could have been supplied only by *dense agricultural populations.*

"Not far from one hundred enclosures, of various sizes, and five hundred mounds, are found in Ross County, Ohio. The number of Tumuli in the State may be safely estimated at ten thousand, and the number of enclosures at one thousand, or fifteen hundred." (*Squier and Davis.*)

From this single State, some idea may be formed of this ante-historical population. Does this look as if the year 648 A. D. was their chronological limit? when, too, we call to mind the facts stated by Dr. Morton, that the skulls found in these mounds correspond with those of the Toltec race, in Mexico, while they differ widely from those of the savages found, on the discovery of America, living around those very time-worn monuments.

"The features common to all," say Squier and Davis, (of the mounds,) "are elementary, and identify them as appertaining to a single grand system, owing its origin to a family of men, moving in the same general direction, acting under common impulses, and influenced by similar causes."

Again, the same authors say,

"The *antiquity* of the ancient monuments of the Mississippi valley has been made the subject of incidental remark, in the foregoing chapters. . . . The fact, that none of the ancient monuments occur upon the latest-formed terraces of the river-valleys of the Ohio, is one of much importance, in its bearings on this question. If, as we are amply warranted in believing, these terraces mark the degrees of subsidence of the streams, one of the four which may be traced has been formed since those streams have followed their present courses. There is no good reason for supposing that the mound-builders would have avoided building upon that terrace, while they erected their works promiscuously on all the others. And if they had built upon it, some slight traces of their works would yet be visible, however much influence we may assign to disturbing causes—overflows and shifting channels. Assuming, then, that the lowest terrace, on the Scioto river, for example, has been formed since the era of the mounds, we must next consider that the excavating power of the Western rivers diminishes yearly, in proportion as they approximate towards a general level. On the lower Mississippi—where, alone, the monuments are sometimes invaded by the water—the bed of the stream is rising, from the deposition of the materials brought down from the upper tributaries, where the excavating process is going on. This excavating power, it is calculated, is in an inverse ratio to the square of the depth—that is to say, diminishes as the square of the depth increases. Taken to be approximatively correct, this rule establishes that the formation of the latest terrace, by the operation of the same causes, must have occupied much more time than the formation of any of the preceding three. Upon these premises, the time since the streams have flowed in their present courses may be divided into four periods, of different lengths, of which the latest, supposed to have elapsed *since the race of the mounds flourished*, is much the longest." . . . . "In all the sepulchral mounds opened and examined, in the course of these investigations, with a single exception, the human remains have been found so much decayed, as to render any attempt to restore the skull, or, indeed, any portion of the skeleton, entirely hopeless. With this experience, it is considered extremely doubtful whether any of the numerous skulls which have been sent abroad, and exhibited as undoubted remains of the mound-builders, were really such. A few are probably genuine," etc. . . . .

"Considering that the earth around these skeletons is wonderfully compact and dry, and that the conditions for their preservation are exceedingly favourable, while they are, in fact, so much decayed, we may form some approximate estimate of their remote antiquity. In the barrows of the ancient Britons, entire, well-preserved skeletons are found, although possessing an *undoubted antiquity of at least eighteen hundred years.* Local causes may produce singular results, in particular instances, but we speak now of these remains in the aggregate."

Another important fact, established by Dr. Morton, is the identity of shape in the skulls of the mound-builders and the Toltecs. He says, in commenting on a head figured in the work of Squier and Davis, from one of the Scioto mounds,

"The vertical occiput, the prominent vertex, and great inter-parietal diameter, all of which are strongly marked in this skull, are features characteristic of the American race, but more particularly of the Toltecan family, and of which the Peruvian head may be taken as the type."

"We pass," continue the same authors, "to another fact, perhaps more important in its bearing upon the question of the antiquity of these works, than any of those presented above. It is, that they are covered with primitive forests, in no way distinguishable from those which surround them, in places where, it is probable, no clearings were ever made. Some of the trees of the forest have a positive antiquity of from six to eight hundred years. They are found surrounded with the mouldering remains of others, undoubtedly of equal original dimensions, but now fallen, and almost incorporated with the soil. Allow a reasonable time for the encroachment of the forest, after the works were abandoned by their builders, and for the period intervening between that event and the date of the construction, and we are compelled to assign them no inconsiderable antiquity. But, as already observed, the forests covering these works correspond, in all respects, with the surrounding forests; the same varieties of trees are found, in the same proportions, and they have a like primitive aspect. This fact was remarked by the late President Harrison, and was put forward, by him, as one of the strongest evidences of the high antiquity of these works. In an address before the Historical Society, of Ohio, he said:

"'The process by which nature restores the forest to its original state, after being once cleared, is extremely slow. The rich lands of the West are, indeed, soon covered again; but the character of the growth is entirely different, and continues so for a long period. In several places upon the Ohio, and upon the farm which I occupy, clearings were made in the first settlement of the country, and sub-

sequently abandoned and suffered to grow up. Some of these new forests are now sure of fifty years growth; but they have made so little progress towards attaining the appearance of the immediately contiguous forest, as to induce any man of reflection to determine that, at least, ten times fifty years must elapse before their complete assimilation can be effected. We find, in the ancient works, all that variety of trees which give such unrivalled beauty to our forests, in natural proportions. . . . Of what immense age, then, must be the works so often referred to, covered, as they are, by *at least the second growth*, after the *primitive forest state was regained?*"

These mounds, from their number and magnitude. give indisputable evidences of the existence of very large agricultural populations. How many centuries were these populations increasing, migrating, and concentrating around so many thousand widely-scattered nuclei? How long was it before they had a density and command of labour requisite for such structures? How long, after building such national monuments, did they live around them, before abandoning them? Were they not the same people who migrated to Mexico and Central America, etc., from the 7th to the 12th century, A. D., or, if they were not, must not a little longer chronology be claimed for all these events? Messrs. Squier and Davis tell us that the skeletons found in the barrows of the Ancient Britons are still perfect, at the end of eighteen hundred years; while those of the Mississippi mounds have crumbled into dust with time. More than all this, the few specimens of skulls, which, under peculiarly favouring circumstances, have been preserved, *show a conformation like no other race of the old continent;* and it may well be asked, where did they come from, if they are not indigenous to the soil? In the three hundred years that the races of the old continent, (since the discovery of Columbus,) have been living in America, not the slightest approximation, any where, has been observed, to the aboriginal type. We *know* that the Jews have preserved their type, unchanged, for three thousand five hundred years, and there are ample grounds for believing that the aborigines of America, as well as the other races, have also preserved, from time immemorial, the same features and skulls.

We must now ask the charitable reader to assist us in finding some explanation of the language of Dr. Howe, when he says, "We can discover *no trace* of an opinion, in the book in question, (Squier and Davis on the Mounds,)

that the authors had any idea of so high an antiquity, in reference to the mound-builders." For ourselves, we cannot believe the reviewer ever read the book thoroughly; or has informed himself on a single point under discussion. It will be seen that, in every thing touching Egypt and China, he has blundered even worse than when on the antiquity of American races.

Certainly, when we trace the physical type of a race to such a probable antiquity, and then find this type to be different from any on the old continent; and when, in addition, we connect, with these facts, the permanence of type, for thousands of years, in Jews, Chinese, Egyptians, etc., it is no very extravagant assertion, to say that America was peopled at the Septuagint date of the flood.

The most important of all the points connected with this discussion, is that of *chronology;* and, in fact, it may be regarded as the pivot on which the whole controversy turns. It might, therefore, have been expected that our reviewer would here have laid out his whole strength; and the more especially, as the Book of Genesis, to which he attaches such vital importance, must rest much of its claims to authenticity on the truthfulness of its chronology.

The reader, therefore, cannot be otherwise than "amazed" at the blunders which we shall take occasion to point out, and for which we are unable to offer an explanation; as the little volume which he was reviewing had placed before him facts and authorities quite sufficient to have saved the reviewer from such an exposure. He has, however, stepped out of his way, to say hard things of others, and the importance of the subject demands that the truth should not be obscured by any tender forbearance in respect to him.

Although the reader may find, in the *review*, other paragraphs quite as objectionable, we shall select a single one for comment, which covers the ground sufficiently.

"As to chronological agreement, Champollion, Figeac, Rosellini, Leemans, and Mr. Gliddon, bring the era of Menes within the limits of the Septuagint chronology. Mr. Gliddon makes the era of Menes, the first historic king in the Egyptian records, to be 2750 B. C., four hundred and ninety-six years after the Septuagint date of the deluge, and five hundred and ninety-six years before Abraham. Sir G. Wilkinson, on the contrary, fixes it at 2201 years B. C., or one hun-

dred and forty-seven years after the deluge, according to the chronology of Usher."

This paragraph would certainly create an innocent smile, in the year 1850, should it meet the eye of any one of the authorities alluded to. The reader is doubtless aware, that it is only about twenty-five years since Champollion and his school had made sufficient advance in Egyptian hieroglyphics, to *commence* decyphering the monuments in which chronology had been so long locked up; that every year has been adding new and important facts to our knowledge; and that it is only *five* years since the celebrated Prussian commission, with Lepsius at its head, returned from Egypt, with some three thousand new inscriptions. Is it not extraordinary, that the reviewer, in the face of such notorious facts, has had the boldness to go back to old books, and old editions, published ten or fifteen years ago, which are now entirely superseded? With what propriety, let us ask, could a writer, twenty years hence, quote Layard's Nineveh, on a question of Assyrian chronology? Rosellini has been dead some years; but Champollion, Figeac, Leemans, and Gliddon have lived to keep pace with advancing science.

With regard to Mr. Gliddon's authority, the reviewer might have saved himself a blunder by a reference to his lectures—published in the Ethnological Journal—to his "Otia Ægyptiaca"—to his handbook of "the Nile," or even to quotations in our lectures; instead of quoting from his "Ancient Egypt," published in 1842. Mr. Gliddon says, in 1848,

> "Misled by English divines, whom I had been erroneously taught to look upon as *authorities* in Biblical criticism and chronology, I attempted, in 1842, to reconcile Egyptian annals with Septuagint computation, stating, at the same time, that I entertained strong doubts of the validity of my endeavours. Since that day, these philosophical heresies have been abandoned, as untenable; and, having devoted four years to Hebraical studies, and the works of continental exegetists, my lectures have been conducted on different principles."

It is generally conceded, by leading authorities, that there reigned over Egypt thirty royal dynasties, previous to the conquest of Alexander, in the 4th century, B. C.; and even Sir G. Wilkinson concedes that the 18th dynasty

commenced as early as 1575, B. C. It is also conceded, that the lower part of Egypt was conquered, at some epoch prior to the 18th dynasty, and held, for a considerable length of time, by the Hyksos, or Shepherd Kings; and lastly, it cannot be denied that the preceding twelve dynasties must have consumed a very long period of time, probably as much as any preceding twelve dynasties; and yet the reviewer, and Wilkinson, would contend that the epoch of Menes might be cut down to 2201 years, B. C.! But even Wilkinson says,

"I am aware that the era of Menes might be carried back to a much more remote period than I have assigned to it; but, as we yet have no authority, farther than the uncertain accounts of Manetho's copyists, to enable us to fix the time, and the number of reigns intervening between his accession and that of Apappus, *I have not placed him earlier, for fear of interfering with the date of the deluge of Noah, which is* 2348, *B. C.! Top. Thebes*, 1835.

This is really a strange reason for twisting facts; but, thanks to recent discoveries, we have no use for this date, or any other, for Noah's flood. In his "Modern Egypt," and "Hand-Book," 1843 and 1849, Wilkinson gives chronology the "go by," though he furnishes ample material for its extension.

Champollion died in 1832, having done little more than "blaze out" the road to be travelled by others. Rosellini, in the same year, commenced the publication of his great work, on Egypt and Nubia, in which, *for the first time*, an effort was made to embrace, in one grand compendium, all the Egyptian inscriptions in that day decyphered. The practical result of his researches was, the monumental restoration of the lost history of Egypt, back to the eighteenth dynasty, computed by him at 1822, B. C., and by Wilkinson, at 1575. Though the date could not, even in 1835, be positively fixed, it was conceded that the truth must be within these limits, and *all the dynasties previous to the eighteenth were still unaccounted for!* Rosellini faithfully published the materials in his possession, throwing back the pyramids into times *previous to the sixteenth dynasty.*

The next great step was made in 1837, to 1839, by Col. Vyse and Perring, in their great work on the pyramids, and, about the same time, the removal of the *Tablet of Abydos*, to the British Museum, was effected. The result

was the recognition of the important fact, that *all* the Memphitic pyramids *antedated* the eighteenth dynasty, and that a vast number of tombs, and other monuments, contemporary with the first twelve dynasties, still remained, to be explored and placed.

Mr. Gliddon very justly remarks, that "we are dealing in events inconceivably remote, with *stratified masses of time*, and not with suppositious calculations, of the *exact* day, week, month, or year."

Another great discovery was made, in 1840, by Lepsius; but was not known to Mr. Gliddon till 1843, after the publication of his *Ancient Egypt*, quoted by our reviewer; viz., that the *Tablet of Abydos*, between cartouche number forty and number thirty-nine, omits the 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th and 17th Manethenian dynasties, thus "*jumping over the entire Hyksos period*," and which marked a new era in the value of genealogical tablets.

Though many important discoveries have been added since, the crowning labour of Lepsius was his triumph amidst the pyramids. We here have all the materials for placing the chronology of Egypt beyond even that of the Septuagint. Until the labours of Vyse and Perring, our knowledge about the pyramids was extremely vague. Their great work, embodying everything known on the subject, was published in 1839, in which they gave exact measurements and descriptions of thirty-nine. Even the *number* of pyramids at Memphis was not counted till 1843, when Lepsius added thirty more, making sixty-nine in all. All these pyramids, too, without exception, belong to the *ancient* kingdom of Egypt, before the irruption of the Hyksos, who invaded Lower Egypt somewhere about 2000, B. C.; and the whole of these were erected, (those, at least, between Aboorooash and Dashoor,) by kings who reigned at Memphis. This is the opinion of Mr. Gliddon, whose opinions the reviewer has innocently misrepresented; and this opinion is shared by Lepsius, Bunsen, Birch, Barruchi, Hinks, Lesseur, Leemans, Henry, Backh, Ampère, Vyse, Rougè, etc.*

* It is a striking fact, that there is to be found no trace of the remarkable events of Jewish history on the Egyptian monuments, though we find such a vast amount of curious detail recorded in hieroglyphics, at various epochs, *prior to the age of Solomon.* This silence of the monuments has induced the belief in many, perhaps a majority of Egyptologists, that all the events, from Abraham to the Exode, occurred during the reign of the Hyksos, who were

"These sixty-nine pyramids," says Gliddon, "represent some seventy or eighty kingly generations, (two kings sometimes having been buried in the same pyramid,) the last of which died *before Abraham* was born;" and from this fact, and the immense labour which we know they required, he shows conclusively, that these pyramids could not have been less than fifteen hundred years in building. Even in the time of Herodotus, 5th century B. C., they were so ancient that their history was almost entirely lost, and we are told by him that the construction of the two largest consumed one hundred and six years.

It will be instructive, also, to our reviewer, to be informed that Rosellini, (to whom he appeals for authority,) knew of but one hundred and seventy cartouches, or royal ovals, between Menes and Cambyses; whereas Lepsius, in 1842, gives about four hundred, recorded in hieroglyphics, and Barucchi increases the list to four hundred and fifty, in 1846. In Rosellini's day, the dates of the pyramids were not even attempted, and their history had not *commenced*. Such has been the wonderful progress in chronology, in the last few years. Even Dr. Nolan, who pushes the epoch of Menes up to 2637 B. C., a date incompatible with the Septuagint chronology, passes over, in silence, many unplaced kings, and evidences drawn from the pyramids.

If farther proof of Egyptian chronology were demanded, it will be found, clear and ample, in the history of mummification,—which is inseparable from that of the pyramids. We are informed by Lepsius, Birch, Gliddon, Bunsen, etc., that the art of mummification antedates all history, and has been traced, with *certainty, to the third dynasty*, which Lepsius places in the *35th century, B. C.* The Bible affords evidence of the antiquity of this art, in the statement, that Jacob and Joseph were embalmed in Egypt, and carried back to Canaan; and, if we are to believe the best authorities of the day, these bodies were

foreigners; and who, instead of *erecting* monuments, occupied much of their time in *destroying* those of the preceding twelve dynasties. The epoch of Abraham was certainly about 2000 years B. C., and it is no less true, that the Exode took place in the beginning of the eighteenth dynasty. The pyramids, through the labours of Lepsius, Vyse and Perring, are now thrown back into the twelve first dynasties; and we think that all the corroborative facts which might be cited, in addition to the silence of the monuments about the Israelites, show that they were contemporary, in Egypt, with these Shepherd Kings of the *middle* age of Egypt.

embalmed during the reign of the Shepherd Kings, or between the twelfth and eighteenth dynasties.

We have before us an elaborate article, by Mr. Birch, of the British Museum, on the "*Epochs of Mummies;*" and even Dr. Howe, if he would take the trouble to find out who and what Mr. Birch *is*, would not call in question one of his well-matured decisions. Mr. Birch traces mummies up to the third dynasty, though but few relics remain of these early reigns. When he comes down to the eleventh, and subsequent dynasties, he finds them in plenty, and details a great deal of curious information about them. We have no space for any thing more than a bare allusion. The great antiquity of mummies is a fixed fact.*

We shall close this hasty sketch of the chronology, with a short table, made out from the "*Chronologie der Ægyptæ*," of Baron Lepsius, which had not reached this country at the time our reviewer perpetrated his dismal doctrinal chronology.

To Lepsius, have all the *savans* of Europe, with one accord, turned their eyes, as the master spirit of the day, in Egyptian discoveries; and, certainly, no one has ever combined the necessary qualifications in a higher degree than himself.

Epoch of Menes—commencement of *historical* period—*Thirty* dynasties.

Old *Empire.*	*B. C.*
1st dyn. Accession of Menes, - -	3893
Commencement of *monumental* period. 3d dyn.	
4th dyn. Pyramids and tombs extant, began,	3426
12th dyn. " " " " ends,	2124

* The pyramids are surrounded by numerous private *contemporary* tombs, which supply a vast amount of curious corroborative information. They are covered with paintings, sculptures, inscriptions, giving evidence of a highly advanced state of civilization, arts, sciences, etc. Lepsius, in 1843, opened one hundred and six of these tombs, representing manners and customs of Egyptians five thousand years ago. So full and accurate was the knowledge derived from these representations, that he promises to "write the *Court Journal* of the fourth Memphitic dynasty."

The hieroglyphical designation, KeSH, applied exclusively to *African* races, as *distinct* from the Egyptians, has been found, by Lepsius, as far back as the monuments of the sixth dynasty, B. C. 3000. There can be no doubt that this term is applied to negroes, and is one of the evidences of the early distinctness of races.

INVASION of the *Hyksos*, comprising the
15th and 16th dyn., from B. C. 2101 to 1590
NEW *Empire.* Restoration.
17th dyn., began, - - - - 1671
30th dyn., ending on the 2d Persian invasion, 340*

The monuments of the early dynasties have been so mutilated, and some six thousand years of time have thrown so many impediments in the way of the best-directed investigations, that it is probable we may never arrive at *perfect accuracy;* but when such scholars as Lepsius, Bockh, Barucchi, Bunsen, Birch, Henry, Lesueur, Prisse, Ampère, Rougè, Hinks, Gliddon, etc., concur in the opinion that Egypt was not only populated, but possessed an organized government, and had erected national monuments, prior to any date which can be drawn from Hebrew records, we cannot but regard the man who will still persevere in opposition, as blinded, and beyond the reach of sense and argument. Is it not extraordinary, too, that our reviewer will appeal to "the numerous *confirmations* of Scripture, which the manners and customs of Egypt, depicted on the monuments, afford," as far back as the eighteenth dynasty; and yet, without a shadow of reason, repudiate the evidence drawn from the preceding monuments, which oppose the doctrines he claims to be "bound to defend."

Let us now pause for a moment, and compare the chronology of Genesis with that of Egypt. The genealogical table already given, shows but ten generations between the deluge and Abraham; which, according to the Hebrew text, consume about 292 years, and, according to the Septuagint, 1070 years. The monumental history of Egypt gives at least twelve *dynasties*, (not *generations*,) antedating Abraham, which must consume incomparably more time; and we might safely challenge the reviewer to find good authority, in the year 1850, to controvert this assertion. It is vain to attempt to get around this dilemma, by saying that Abraham, and his postdiluvian ancestors, lived longer than we of the present day. We *know*

* It should be remarked that, while Lepsius, from new data, is pushing back the era of Menes to 3893 B. C., he has actually *lowered* that of Israelitish history. He places Abraham about 1500 B. C., and the Exodus 1309 B. C. It is to be hoped that his great work will soon be translated, as it must, at least, put an end to all "short chronology."

that their cotemporaries, in Egypt, lived no longer than generations of modern times; and no one will contend for difference of longevity between Jews and Egyptians. Abraham and Sarah had never heard of their fathers and grand-fathers living to these extravagant ages; for they were both astonished, and Sarah laughed, when told that she should bear a child, at the age of ninety!

Nor is it less vain to attempt to get round the difficulty, as is now becoming the fashion, by saying "that Genesis was not intended to teach chronology." We can, as Professor Stuart says, only judge what it intends to teach, *by its language;* there can be no other rule of interpretation; and the 5th, 10th and 11th chapters of this book *do* give us, in plain language, *genealogies* and *chronology*, without qualification. It teaches *genealogies* and *chronology*, as clearly as language can speak, which are manifestly wrong; and which, though Christ passed over in silence, (as he did much else in the Old Testament that might have been corrected) he did not vouch for or affirm. It did not belong to his mission to teach other than those truths which were absolutely essential to the faith which he brought. He, at least, did not peril the vital in the vain assertion of the unimportant.

But we have already overleaped our prescribed bounds, and must draw to a close; though more than half the reviewer's errors are left uncorrected. The essential points, however, have been seized, and enough, we trust, has been said to serve as a caution to him and his *collaborateurs*, against the expression of hasty and erroneous opinions, on subjects of such gravity, and to which they have shown themselves so unequal. Let us, for a moment, look back and ask what are the true questions at issue? They are simply these:

1st. Are all the races of men, of Europe, Asia, Africa, America, Australia, &c., whose diverse types antedate all history, descended from Noah's family?

2d. Does the Bible, in a historical sense, teach such community of origin, or does it, except incidentally, speak of any other than the *Hebrew* race?

We have given a decided negative to these questions, for the following general reasons:

1st. Because the account given in Genesis itself, of the wide dispersion of mankind, soon after the flood, and of different nations, different tongues, large cities, &c., in the

3d and 4th generations from Noah, is utterly irreconcilable with the idea of a common origin.

2d. Because the earliest biblical date for the deluge, which can possibly be contended for, is the year 3,246 B. C.; and it has been clearly demonstrated, by the most competent Egyptologists of the present day, that Egypt, long previous to this date, was a populous and highly civilized nation, with monuments standing, and on many of which were recorded evidences of distinct races.

3d. Because it is proven, from authentic records, (admitted, too, by the reviewer's quotations from Medhurst) that the Chinese chronology extends beyond all Jewish annals; and because there are good and sufficient reasons for believing that India, America, and other countries, had peculiar races, contemporary with those of China and Egypt.

4th. Because the types of men now seen on the earth, may be traced to the remotest times of which we have any knowledge; and because we have no authenticated example of the transformation of one type into another. The Jews, in every climate of the four quarters of the globe, have preserved substantially the same type which they carried with them to Egypt 3,500 years ago.

5th. Because it is conceded that the writers of the Old and New Testaments no where give evidence of more extensive geographical and ethnographical knowledge than their profane contemporaries; which knowledge was limited to a small fraction of the earth bordering on the Mediterranean.

6th. And lastly, because the most learned theologians, of all nations, are far from being agreed as to the degree of authenticity and *historical* accuracy, of the various books of the Old and New Testaments; thus leaving the field open to fair investigation.

Not only is it our misfortune to differ widely from the reviewer on the foregoing points, but also as to the *importance* of the subject before us. "Our amazement," says he, "is not diminished, when we consider the *trifling* cause for this outcry against scripture (doctrine?) Dr. Nott imagines the Ethiopians to be a different race from ourselves."

No man capable of philosophical reflection, can regard the diversity of races as a "trifling" fact. If it really be a *truth*, as we believe, (and in this opinion we are sus-

tained by Agassiz, Morton, Pickering,* and other leading authorities) that there are several races, of distinct origins; if, too, these races differ in physical organization, in intellectual and moral perfectibility; and are severally formed to flourish best in certain climates, and in certain positions in the social scale; what mind can grasp its endless bearings, or what true philanthropist could wish to strangle its investigation? The 3,000,000 of blacks in the United States, the condition of the West Indies, the Indian population of America, &c., &c., certainly afford something more than "trifling cause"—not to speak of other causes—for this "outcry" against doctrine, which, we contend, the true Scripture was never intended to assert.

When the reviewer presumes to "denounce" the "views" of others, "as dangerous to religion, morality and law," he arrogates for himself and his doctrines a supremacy which will not be conceded in a free and enlightened country. We trust that we have never been wanting in proper respect for the clergy of all denominations, or backward in extending them kindnesses when occasion offered; and it shall be our pride and pleasure to continue

* Dr. Bachman has afforded us considerable occasion for argument, when he undertakes to treat on this subject of the races; so extraordinary has been his misunderstanding of the plain language of Agassiz, Morton and Pickering. He quotes, in his book, a paragraph from Agassiz, to prove that he was in favour of unity, which *we* construed in the opposite sense. M. Agassiz has put him right in the matter since. The Dr. seems equally determined not to understand Dr. Morton; but we will take the liberty of informing him, that Dr. Morton fully concurs with us on this point. And, as for Pickering, we shall quote a paragraph from page 305, of his "*Races of Man.*"

After speaking of Animals and Plants, he says:

"Not so, however, with the human family. Notwithstanding the mixtures of race, during two centuries, in the United States, no one has remarked a tendency to the development of a new race. In Arabia, where the mixtures are more complicated, and have been going on from time immemorial, the result does not appear to have been different. On the Egyptian monuments I was unable to detect a change in the races of the human family. Neither does written history afford evidence of the extinction of one physical race of men, or the development of another previously unknown."

Dr. Bachman tells us, that he has "recently read very few of the numerous works written on the subject"—has not even read the last edition of Prichard. We think he had better quit reading entirely, until he can learn to understand plain English, and writing, until he learns common courtesy. We must, however, in justice to the Dr., give him full credit for his boldness, in attempting to work a subject so vast out of his own brain, without assistance from others.

"And still they gazed, and still the wonder grew,
How one small head could carry all he knew."

those friendly relations which have always existed between us. We shall not, however, so far forget our self-respect, as to submit tamely to aggression and insults, like those that we have taken in hand to resent, from any respectable source.

Dr. Prichard may be taken as a fair type of this school of theological naturalists. He was for forty years writing on this subject, and, with every edition was changing his ground, as science advanced upon him,—until, in his last, he gives up the chronology of Genesis, the ages of the patriarchs, and, in fact, its authenticity. We shall close with a quotation from Mr. Burke, editor of the Ethnological Journal—pp. 281.

"We look upon Dr. Prichard as the victim of a false theory; perhaps no one has been more injured by a theory than he has been by his. With learning enough, and talent enough, and patience and candour enough, to confer benefits of the highest order upon science, his great work leaves ethnology just where it found it. We are not aware that it has developed a single great fact or principle. In its purely ethnological department, nothing is concluded, nothing is proved, all is vagueness and generalization, from the beginning to the end. How, indeed, could it be otherwise? Vagueness can beget nothing but vagueness; or what could be expected from a theory originally based, not upon a scientific demonstration, but upon a theological assumption. Science is difficult enough to the free; how can any great results be expected from those who, notwithstanding their earnest love of truth, are still compelled, from their education or position, to approach to certain subjects with unsandalled feet, and reverential awe, and humbled intellects? Nature unveils herself to the brave alone—to those who look upon her with an ardent and fearless gaze, convinced that she has nothing to reveal that is not noble, and beautiful, and good."

J. C. N.

Mobile, Ala.

CHRONOLOGY,

ANCIENT AND SCRIPTURAL;

BEING A REPLY TO AN

ARTICLE CONTAINED IN THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, REVIEWING NOTT'S LECTURES ON THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE BIBLICAL AND PHYSICAL HISTORY OF MAN.

[FROM THE SOUTHERN QUARTERLY REVIEW FOR NOVEMBER 1850.]

BY J. C. NOTT, M. D.,
Of Mobile, Ala.

CHARLESTON, S. C.
STEAM-POWER PRESS OF WALKER AND JAMES.
1850.

BS
607

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: May 2005

Preservation Technologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 014 328 717 8